

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated February 27, 2007, having a shortened statutory period set to expire May 29, 2007. Claim 2 is currently amended. Claims 1-20 are presently pending.

Applicants' undersigned representative appreciates the telephone calls to the Examiner on June 1 and June 26, 2007. Although the proposed amendments were not reviewed, the undersigned appreciates the Examiner's willingness to discuss the present amendment upon review of same. Such a call to 512.617.5533 would be greatly appreciated.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 2 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "*PowerQuest PartitionMagic 8.0 User Guide*" ("*PartitionMagic*") in view of "*Mastering Windows 95*" by Robert Cowart ("*Cowart*"). In paragraph 3 of the present Office Action, Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Talbert* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0114265 – "*Talbert*") in view of *Cowart*. The present Office Action gives no explanation for the rejection, found in the Office Action Summary, of claims 13-14 and 19. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections.

With reference to exemplary **Claim 1**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest "selecting a file display for a single file on a graphical user interface (GUI) after engaging a first input and a second input from the plurality of inputs, wherein a first operation is associated with the first input and a second operation is associated with the second input, and wherein a first portion of the file display of the single file presents a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation, and wherein a second portion of the file display of the single file presents a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation."

The Examiner cites *PartitionMagic* for teaching that a GUI can display different functions that can be called upon (“e.g., “create”, “resize”, etc.). *Cowart* is cited for the teaching that a single operation (“cut”) can incorporate two different operations (“copy” and “delete”). However, this combination of art does not teach or suggest the inventive concept of representing a single file in a manner that indicates that two user-selected operations have been applied to that file (“a first portion of the file display of the single file presents a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation, and wherein a second portion of the file display of the single file presents a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation”).

Furthermore, it is clear that *PartitionMagic* only contemplates a single operation being applied to a file. For example, in page 18 of *PartitionMagic*, under the heading “Selecting an Operation,” *PartitionMagic* teaches the user to “Click **one** of the operations on the action panel or the toolbar.” (**Emphasis added.**)

Thus, *PartitionMagic* teaches that only one operation can be applied to a file; *Cowart* teaches that two operations (“copy” and “delete”) can be combined into a single icon. However, there is no teaching or suggestion, outside of the present disclosure, of selectively combining two operations for visualization on a file icon in a manner that depicts the two distinct operations.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 2**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “subsequently executing the first and second operations on the single file, after the first and second distinct visual features are respectively displayed on the first and second portions of the file display and are confirmed for execution”, as supported by paragraph [0030] and Figure 5 of the originally filed specification. That is, *Cowart* teaches that a “cut” operation can be performed, but there is no teaching or suggestion of first displaying a visual image of the two operations on a file icon, and then subsequently executing those two operations only after they have been confirmed for execution.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 3**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest that the “distinct visual features” that are associated with the different “operations” are color coded. The Examiner cites *PartitionMagic* for teaching this on page 15. However,

PartitionMagic actually teaches that “files”, not “operations”, can be color coded. Similarly, with regards to **Claim 4** (“distinct visual features are geometric patterns”), *PartitionMagic* does not teach that operations can be visually coded by geometric patterns, but rather that geometric patterns can be used to mark boot boundaries.

With reference now to exemplary **Claim 6**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “identifying a plurality of sensitive files on a computer” which are then deleted, followed a reformatting of the storage area on a disk drive that previously had stored the identified sensitive files.

It is axiomatic that it is improper to use “the claimed invention as an instruction manual or ‘template’ to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious.” *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The Examiner’s statement that “One would be motivated to identify sensitive files before deleting to ensure that only the desired files are deleted” is not suggested in the cited art. Rather, such is part of the novelty of the presently claimed invention.

Furthermore, with regards to **Claim 7**, there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of the cited art for deleting “only sensitive files that had been last edited before a pre-determined period of time.” The Examiner cites *Talbert* for teaching that a file that “is no longer needed” can be erased. This is not germane to the teaching of the presently claimed invention, in which files are deleted if they have not been edited for some “pre-determined period of time.” Speaking in general hypothetical terms, one can easily support the position that an unnecessary file may be one that was just edited, while an important file may be one that has never been edited during its long lifetime. To conceptual equate “not needed” with “not recently edited” exceeds the teaching or suggestion of the prior art.

CONCLUSION

As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice
Registration No. 44,545
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)